

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 1-5 and 11-13, because of various claim terminology used throughout the claims, which the Examiner considered to be informal; nevertheless the Examiner indicated that the claims are patentable.

Applicant has amended the claim language in response to most of the objections.

For example, in response to the objection in the fifth paragraph of the Office Action to “traveling time obtaining means” in claim 2, Applicant has amended this term to read a “timer.”

In response to the objection in the sixth paragraph of the Office Action to the term “travel distance obtaining means in claims 1, 4, and 11, Applicant has amended this term to read an “odometer.”

In response to the objection in the seventh paragraph of the Office Action, Applicant has deleted the term “for” in claims 11-13 to obviate the “intent to use” issue of concern to the Examiner.

Applicant, however, traverses the objection set forth in the third paragraph of the Office Action to the term “abnormal reception.” The Examiner appears to misconstrue this term. As used in the claims, “abnormal reception” refers, *e.g.*, to a condition wherein a faulty connection or an obstruction in the reception area of a position detecting device prevents the position detecting device from correctly measuring the vehicle location. Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, a warning device to warn of such abnormal reception is not required for the mobile object position detecting apparatus, as the apparatus is broadly recited in the claims.

Applicant also traverses the objection set forth in the fourth paragraph of the Office Action to the term “means for detecting . . . position information.” A “means for

detecting . . . position information" is not limited to only a GPS. As described in the specification, the claimed means can encompass any device for detecting the position of a mobile object according to the position information transmitted from an external position information transmission apparatus, including, but not limited to, a GPS. While a GPS may have been a preferred embodiment and best mode known at the time the application was filed, the claims are not limited to a GPS, and a GPS may not be the only commercially-acceptable device capable of serving as a means for detecting position information for the entire term of the patent. Under U.S. law, the patentee is entitled to the full scope of coverage supported by the specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and the Applicant is entitled to write its claims in the format allowed by 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph. This objection, therefore, has no merit, and should be withdrawn.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 4, 2008

By: 
James W. Edmondson
Reg. No. 33,871